

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

RICHARD FELTZ, ASHTON DENNIS,
on behalf of themselves and all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS OF THE COUNTY
OF TULSA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No.: 18-cv-298-CVE-JFJ

NON-PARTY’S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

The Administrative Director of the Courts, Jari Askins, (“Askins”), on behalf of the State of Oklahoma’s Administrative Office of the Courts (“AOC”), (collectively “State”), by and through counsel, Assistant Attorney General Jeb Joseph, hereby moves this Court for entry of a protective order governing materials to be produced by State in compliance with this Court’s order [Doc. 267]. In support hereof, the State submits the following:

1. State is a non-party to this litigation.
2. As part of the judicial branch functions of the State of Oklahoma, State maintains certain information relating to persons and events involved with court actions.
3. The information maintained by State in this regard includes a mix of publicly available and non-publicly available information, which is sometimes highly sensitive in nature.
4. Additionally, the format of the information maintained by State is not all available to the public, and would not be presented to parties in this forum absent the Court’s order [Doc. 267].

5. Safe and secure maintenance of the information is critical to operations of the State's court system and to compliance with State law.

6. Plaintiff subpoenaed certain records maintained by State.

7. State opposed production, and Plaintiff filed a Motion to Compel Compliance with the Subpoena [Doc. 210].

8. After briefing and a hearing, the Court granted in part, and denied in part, Plaintiff's Motion. [Doc. 267]. Upon application by State [Doc. 280], the Court extended the original deadline for production. [Doc. 284].

9. In light of these and other considerations, and in compliance with the Court's orders [Docs. 267 and 268], herein, the undersigned counsel communicated and conferred with Plaintiff's counsel and Defendants' counsel about the proposed Protective Order. Plaintiff's counsel has made multiple edits to the standard form provided by the Court. State's counsel has also made multiple edits to the standard form. The Plaintiff's edits included such items as not making their statistical analyses of the AOC data confidential, and making clear that this protective order would only apply to materials produced by State in response to the underlying subpoena and court order. State's changes included things like making clear the material at hand is electronic data in particular, and the heightened sensitive nature of data maintained by the Oklahoma Supreme Court and its AOC. The collective edits also included removal of references to usual party-opponent Discovery mechanisms such as written discovery requests, which would not apply to a non-party such as State. The proposed order now presented is a culmination of those collective and collaborative efforts.

10. Plaintiff does not oppose the entry of this protective order as presented.

11. Defendants do not oppose the entry of this protective order as presented.

12. State stands ready to produce the materials as ordered by the Court.

WHEREFORE, premises considered, State moves this Court to enter its proposed (and wholly unopposed) protective order governing the materials produced by State/AOC.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeb Joseph

JEB JOSEPH, OBA # 19137

Assistant Attorney General

Oklahoma Attorney General's Office

Litigation Division

313 N. E. 21st Street

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Telephone: (405) 521-3921

Facsimile: (405) 521-4518

Email: Jeb.Joseph@oag.ok.gov

*Attorney for non-party, Administrative Office
of the Courts*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 13th day of May 2021, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served via the Court's ECF system to all registered counsel for the litigants herein.

/s/ Jeb Joseph

Jeb Joseph